

10/749,311

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed December 7th, 2006. Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

Election/Restrictions

According to the Election/Restriction required under 35 U.S.C. 121 as detailed in the Office action of December 7th, 2006, applicant provisionally elected the invention of Group I, comprising claims 1-3, for prosecution on the merits. This provisional election was made in a telephone conversation with registered Agent We-Te Chung on Dec. 1, 2006.

Applicant hereby affirms the provisional election of Group I, comprising claims 1-3, for prosecution on the merits. Applicant also confirms the resultant Examiner's Amendment, whereby claims 4-8 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-3 are pending.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 are understood as having been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lizee et al (US 5,671,404, hereinafter "Lizee"). Applicant respectfully traverses as follows:

Claim 1 recites in part:

*'a scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report; [and]
an identifying sub-module for identifying whether data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters'.*

Applicant submits that Lizee does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 1.

10/749.311

In figures 1A, 1B, and 3, Lizee discloses a data processing system for querying databases automatically. Lizee further discloses an Automatically Relaxable Query (ARQ). The ARQ includes a list of query conditions ordered in descending degree of importance. First, the database is queried on the first condition of the ARQ; if any object is found, the system labels this first condition. Then the system proceeds with a query composed of all the conditions labeled previously in conjunction with the next condition of the ARQ; if any object is found, then this next condition is labeled. The system continues to proceed in this manner until a predetermined termination condition is achieved. Finally, the system reports conditions that were labeled, and if the query composed of the labeled conditions matches only a few objects of the database, then these objects are automatically retrieved. The automatic querying with the ARQ enables faster searches, minimizes interaction between database and user, and permits offline preparation of the search.

According to Lizee, the databases are queried according to the ARQ that comprises a list of query conditions, not by scanning the databases to query the databases. That is, Lizee does not disclose or teach anything like the feature of "scanning a structured information report". Furthermore, Lizee cannot achieve the function of querying and mining data from the structured information report after scanning the structured information report and identifying whether data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters. It is apparent that the different querying processes respectively of the present invention and of Lizee will result in different query results. That is, Lizee does not disclose or teach the feature of "identifying whether data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters." Accordingly, it is submitted that Lizee does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the feature of "the scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report and the identifying sub-module for identifying whether

10/749,311

data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters," as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In addition, Lizee obtains and displays the results of the ARQ search simply by informing users of the marked conditions of the ARQ, not through the structured information report and the mined data as recited in claim 1.

In conclusion, applicant submits that there is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Lizee of the features highlighted above, as set forth in claim 1. That is, the system of claim 1 is substantially different from Lizee's system. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Lizee under both 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Lizee is requested.

Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 2-3 should also be patentable over Lizee.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanaegami et al (US 5,297,039, hereinafter "Kanaegami"). Applicant respectfully traverses as follows:

Claim 1 recites in part:

'a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark'.

Applicant submits that Kanaegami does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the feature described above as set forth in claim 1.

In figures 1-6, Kanaegami discloses a text information extraction device for extracting analysis networks from texts and storing the analysis networks in a database. The analysis networks consist of lines, and each line includes elements and relations extracted from the texts. The analysis networks are complemented via a synonym/near synonym/thesaurus process and via a complementary template, and the lines thereof are

10/749,311

weighted via a concept template. A text similarity matching device detects similarities of inputs and database analysis networks on the bases of agreements of words, word pairs, and lines. A text search system stores texts and complementary term lists prepared therefrom in respective databases. Queries are inputted in the form of the analysis networks from which sets of keywords and relations are extracted. After searching the texts and complementary term lists stored in the databases with respect to the keywords extracted from each input query, agreements of the sets of keywords and relations are determined.

According to Kanaegami, a line in the analysis network can be marked when the line in the analysis network matches a line in the concept template. The concept template includes technical information in the form of lines, the technical information consisting of elements and relations between the elements. By contrast, the system of claim 1 of the present application provides marking a field of the structured information report when the field of the structured information report matches the mining parameters. Accordingly, applicant asserts that Kanaegami fails to disclose or suggest the feature of *marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark*, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Kanaegami only outputs and displays the analysis network with marked lines as search results. However, the structured information report and the marked field of the structured information report as claimed in claim 1 are the search results presented to users.

In conclusion, applicant submits that the system of claim 1 of the present application is substantially different from that of Kanaegami, and that Kanaegami fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Kanaegami under both 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Kanaegami are requested.

10/749,311

Claim 1 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adler et al (US 2003/0033295, hereinafter "Adler"). Applicant respectfully traverses as follows:

Claim 1 recites in part:

'the system being programmed to mine data from a structured information report for analyzing, and comprising:

a data mining module for mining data from the structured information report, the data mining module comprising:

a parameter obtaining sub-module for obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command; and

a querying sub-module for querying data from the structured information report in accordance with the mining parameters'.

Applicant submits that Adler does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the features described above, as set forth in claim 1.

Adler discloses that a user searches at least one database by building a search query. During the search step, the user may interact and tweak/modify the search results by selecting or rejecting one or more of the search results. Adler further discloses that when the user is pleased with the search results obtained with the refined concept query or the revised search query, said refined concept query or said revised search query may be used as the final search query for submission to other document databases (Adler, para. 90). However, Adler does not disclose, teach or even suggest the features relating to the structured information report as recited in claim 1.

According to Adler, only a revised search query is created. Adler does not obtain mined information from the initial search results. By contrast, the system of claim 1 of the present application mines data from the structured information report by scanning the structured information report

x

10:749.311

and identifying whether data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters.

In conclusion, applicant submits that the system of claim 1 of the present application is substantially different from that of Adler, and that Adler fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Adler under both 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Adler and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee et al.

By 

Wei-Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137